



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

INVENTOR(S)

Gerald S. Gordon

TITLE

OPACITY DESKTOP WITH DEPTH

PERCEPTION

APPLICATION NO.

10/040,808

FILED

January 7, 2002

CONFIRMATION NO.

2903

EXAMINER

Ryan F. Pitaro

ART UNIT

2174

NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE

February 9, 2006

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

A1197-US-NP

XERZ 2 00449

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.10

"Express Mail" Mailing Label Number:

EV 690740653 US

Date of Deposit:

March 3/2, 2006

I hereby certify that the attached Fee(s) Transmittal Form, Issue Fee, Publication Fee, Response to Statement of Reasons for Allowance and "Fee Address" Indication Form are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Karen M. Forsyth

(Typed or Printed Name of Sender)

Express Mail" Mailing Label Number: Date of Deposit: EV 690740653 US March 2, 2006

I hereby certify that this paper, and all documents indicated therein as being attached are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop Issue Fee, P.O. Box

1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Karen M. Forsyth

MAR 03 2006

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ÍNVENTOR(S)

Gerald S. Gordon

TITLE

OPACITY DESKTOP WITH DEPTH

PERCEPTION

APPLICATION NO.

10/040,808

FILED

January 7, 2002

CONFIRMATION NO.

2903

EXAMINER

Ryan F. Pitaro

ART UNIT

2903

ALLOWED

February 9, 2006

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

A1197-US-NP

XERZ 2 00449

RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Mail Stop Issue Fee

Dear Sir:

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication as to the allowance of the present application.

However, applicant respectfully submits the Statements of Reasons for Allowance are, in and of themselves, inappropriate. It is noted that the reasons for allowance may be set forth in instances in which " . . . the Examiner believes that the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a

claim or claims." (37 CFR §1.104(e)(2004)). In the present case, applicant believes the record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear and, therefore, no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. Furthermore, the applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance.

Specifically, it has been indicated that the claims are allowed by importing interpretations into the claims in relation to the prior art that results in a potential imprecise and/or inaccurate understanding of the reasons. This places an unwarranted interpretation upon the claims. Such a characterization of the claims does not properly take into account applicants' claimed invention as reflected in the specification and the applicant's responses to the Examiner's office actions.

Therefore, while applicants believe the claims are allowable, applicants do not acquiesce that patentability resides in only the features, exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP

March 2, 2006

Mark S. \$vat

Reg. No. 34,261

1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579

(216) 861-5582